

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPAREMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

PPLICATION NO	EILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ALTORNEY DOCKED NO	ONEIRMAII NA
09 987,687	11 15 2001	Matthew C. Coffey	032775-078	7180
7590 (2.03.2002			1 NAMINER	
Gerald F. Swiss BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			ANGELL, JON E	
			DATE MAILED: 12/03/2002	10

Please find below and or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>L</u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
~	Application No.					
Advisory Action	09/987,687	COFFEY ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MANUAL DATE of this communication and	J. Eric Angell	1635				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 14 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applic ) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a the places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	ng date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of t	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		•				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been cons	idered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:		JEFFREY FREDMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER				
		J. Eric Angell				

## Continuation Sh et (PTO-303)

Application No. 09/987,687

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendement would change the independent claim (claim 1) to reme a limitation not previously present in the claims. The new limitation would require that the injected virus is capable of selectively replicating in tumor cells. Therefore, the proposed amendment raises new issues that would require further search and consideration and the amendment has not been entered. Furthermore, Applicants arguments are moot because the arguments are directed to rejections of claims comprising the limitation(s) of the proposed amendment which has not been entered.